

## REMARKS

Claims 1-53 are pending in the application prior to this Amendment. In this Amendment, Applicant is canceling claims 1 and 15; amending claims 2-4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 22-24, 26, 28, 29, 42, 47, and 51; and adding claims 54-76. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein are requested.

The Office has indicated that claims 6, 12, 19-23, 26, 27, 29-41, and 47-53 include allowable subject matter.

Applicants amended paragraph [0060] of the Specification as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants amended paragraph [0064] of the Specification to correct an error identified by the Examiner. Applicants assert no new matter was added. Applicants request withdrawal of the objections to the specification.

Applicants cancelled claims 1 and 15, thereby rendering the rejection of claims 1 and 15 as being moot.

Claim 6 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, which Applicants have done. Applicants amended claims 2-4, 7, 8, 11 and 14 to change the dependency of these claims to claim 6. Applicants assert that claims 2-8, 11, 13, and 14 are allowable, and request indication from the Office of the same.

Claim 12 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, which Applicants have done. Applicants added claims 61-67, which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 12. Applicants assert that claims 12 and 61-67 are allowable, and request indication from the Office of the same.

Claim 22 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, which Applicants have done. Applicants amended claims 16, 17, 24, and

28 to change the dependency of these claims to claim 22. Applicants assert that claims 16-22, 24, 25, and 28 are allowable, and request indication from the Office of the same.

Claim 23 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, which Applicants have done. Applicants added claims 68-76, which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 23. Applicants assert that claims 23 and 68-76 are allowable, and request indication from the Office of the same.

Claim 26 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, which Applicants have done. Applicants assert that claims 26 and 27 are allowable, and request indication from the Office of the same.

Claim 29 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, which Applicants have done. Applicants assert that claims 29-41 are allowable, and request indication from the Office of the same.

Claim 47 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, which Applicants have done. Applicants assert that claims 47-50 are allowable, and request indication from the Office of the same.

Claim 51 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, which Applicants have done. Applicants assert that claims 51-53 are allowable, and request indication from the Office of the same.

Applicants amended claims 9 and 42 into independent form. Claims 9 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,755,728 (Ban) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,600,864 (Sato). From the Office's comments, it appears that the Office acknowledges that neither Ban nor Santo teach or suggest the I-bar portion being formed of grain-oriented steel. Rather the Office only states, "It is very important to note that, as long as

the electric steel can conduct magnetic flux, the steel can be used to construct a motor core, whether the steel is grain-oriented or non-grain-oriented.” While the Applicants don’t disagree with the Office’s assertion, Applicants note that a preferred construction of the invention includes the I-bar portion being formed of grain-oriented electric steel, which has some benefits over the I-bar portion being formed of non-grain oriented electric steel. See, e.g., paragraph [0033] and FIG. 16 of the Application. Therefore, Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 9 and 42 as presented by the Office. Accordingly, Applicants assert claims 9, 10, 42-46, and 54-60 are allowable, and request indication from the Office of the same.

## CONCLUSION

Entry of the Amendment and allowance of claims 2-14 and 16-76 are respectfully requested. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,



Sheldon L. Wolfe  
Reg. No. 43,996

Docket No.: 010121-9954-00  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108

(414) 271-6560